

1 **WO**

2
3
4
5
6 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
7 **FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**
8

9 Susana E. Verduzco,

10 Plaintiff,

11 v.

12 Kimberly A Mulligan, et al.,

13 Defendants.
14

No. CV-19-04745-PHX-DWL

ORDER


15 On September 24, 2019, the Court issued an order dismissing Plaintiff's *pro se*
16 complaint—which, in a nutshell, asserted a medical malpractice claim against a doctor
17 employed by the United States Department of Veterans Affairs (“VA”)—due to Plaintiff's
18 failure to exhaust administrative remedies. (Doc. 22.) In response, Plaintiff has filed a
19 motion for reconsideration. (Doc. 24.) Although the motion is not a model of clarity,
20 Plaintiff appears to be arguing that reconsideration is warranted because, among other
21 things, (1) a VA doctor in Arkansas was recently charged with federal crimes in an
22 unrelated lawsuit, (2) “President Trump’s impeach inquiry . . . support[s] . . . this motion.”
23 (*Id.*)

24 The motion for reconsideration will be denied. Motions for reconsideration are
25 disfavored and should be denied “absent a showing of manifest error or a showing of new
26 facts or legal authority that could not have been brought to [the Court’s] attention earlier
27 with reasonable diligence.” LRCiv. 7.2(g). Reconsideration is an “extraordinary remedy”
28 that is available only in “highly unusual circumstances.” *Kona Enters., Inc. v. Estate of*

1 *Bishop*, 229 F.3d 877, 890 (9th Cir. 2000) (citations omitted). No such extraordinary
2 circumstances are present here. *Cf. MacDonald v. Chaney*, 2007 WL 274313, *2 (D. Ariz.
3 2007) (rejecting plaintiff's argument that "committing malpractice is not within the scope
4 of the employee's conduct" under Arizona law).

5 Accordingly, **IT IS ORDERED** that Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration (Doc.
6 24) is **denied**.

7 Dated this 15th day of October, 2019.

8
9
10 
11 _____
12 Dominic W. Lanza
13 United States District Judge
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28